



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,267	03/26/2004	Andrew Kapochunas	384.7817USU	8528
7590 11/06/2008				
Paul D. Greeley, Esq. Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. 10th Floor One Landmark Square Stamford, CT 06901-2682				
EXAMINER				
PARDO, THUY N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2168				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,267

Applicant(s)

KAPOCHUNAS ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy N. Pardo

Art Unit

2168

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008 and 30 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,11,12,14,18-20 and 22-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,11,12,14,18-20 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 25-27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-949)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/30/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on July 28, 2008 and IDS filed on September 30, 2008. Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 12, 14, 18-20 and 22-27 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 9, 10, 13, 15-17, 21 are canceled and claims 25-27 are added. This Office Action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 12, 14, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. (Hereinafter "Clark") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0153663, in view of Monteverde US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088553.

As to claim 1, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising: receiving at least one input address [obtain street address information, 10 of fig. 1; 0040; comparing said at least one input address to at least one standard [compare to old street address or a reference address, 12 of fig. 1; 22-80 of fig. 2; 0041].

However, Clark does not explicitly teach providing a single best address derived from said at least one input address based on said comparison although it has the same functionality of performing updating address file based on the addresses comparison [84 of fig. 2]. Monteverde teaches providing a single best address derived from said at least one input address based on said comparison [determine the best site(s) based on the “search term” matches and then display it to the user, see the abstract; 6 of fig. 2; 13 of fig. 3; 21 of fig. 5; 0036], and matching said single best address to a database having unique business identifiers associated with addresses to find a matching address and providing a matching address for correction of said input address [update the database and provide the searcher's with the most relevant Internet site(s) for any given search term based upon prior results, 0016; 0036].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Monteverde for comparing each Internet site (i.e., address) with a “search term” (i.e., standard or criteria) to provide the best Internet site address to Clark's system of providing a new address (updated address) based on all information of both addresses- current address and “change to” address. The motivation being to expand and enhance the versatility of Clark's system to provide the best accurate address based on the comparison. Clark further teaches matching said single best address to a database having unique business identifiers associated with addresses to find a matching address and providing said matching address [0032-0034; 0043].

Art Unit: 2168

As to claim 3, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed.

Clark further teaches that said database is an advanced office system (AOS) [0041].

As to claim 4, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed.

Clark further teaches providing a match project analysis report [0290; 0296; 0301].

As to claim 5, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed.

Clark further teaches converting said at least one input address to a predetermined record layout, before comparing said input address to said at least one standard [30-80 of fig. 2].

As to claim 6, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed.

Clark further teaches associating said at least one input address with at least one code, said code being used to determine said single best address [0051-0081; 0094-0103].

As to claim 7, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed.

Clark further teaches associating said at least one input address with at least one score, said score being used to determine said single best address [0222-0223; fig. 19-15].

As to claim 8, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed.

Clark further teaches that said at least one standard is at least one selected from the group consisting of: ZIP+4 coding, coding accuracy support system (CASS), Locatable Address Conversion System (LACS), delivery sequence file (DSF), and National Change of Address (NCOA) [0041-0042].

As to claim 14, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches an investigator for investigating any address not matched, upon request [0031; 0036].

As to claim 18, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said view is at least one selected from the group consisting of: alphabetical, most frequent content, and alpha characters only [0032-0034; 0036].

As to claims 11, 12 and 19 and 20, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

3. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. (Hereinafter "Clark") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0153663, in view of Monteverde US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088553, in further view of Burdick et al. (Hereinafter "Burdick") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0107205.

As to claim 22, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of accessing a record having said input address and correcting said record based on said matching address although it has the same functionality of performing updating address file based on the addresses comparison.

Art Unit: 2168

Burdick teaches accessing a record having said input address and correcting said record based on said matching address [0057-0067]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Burdick to Clark-Monteverde's system as an essential means to provide a new address (updated address) based on all information of both addresses- current address and "change to" address.

As to claims 23 and 24, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 25-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claims 25-27, the limitation of receiving a unique business identifier, and wherein said matching also includes matching said unique business identifier to said database, to find said matching address for correction of said input address, taken together with other limitations of claims 1, 12 and 20 was not disclosed by the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed September 30, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither cited references teach either of (i) a database of unique business identifiers or (ii) correction of an input address.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Burdick teaches accessing a record having said input address and correcting said record based on said matching address [0057-0067]. Clark teaches obtaining address information from the user by using street address information as the basis for gathering and then comparing to old street address [see 10 and 12 of fig. 1; 0088-0089], and correcting the input address by changing the updated information to the database [158 of fig. 3].

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2168

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy N. Pardo whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thuy N. Pardo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168